1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI NORTHERN DIVISION
3	
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
5	vs. Criminal Action No. 3:16CR50-DPJ-FKB
6	
7	CARL REDDIX
8	
9	COURT REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING
10	
11	BEFORE HONORABLE DANIEL P. JORDAN, III UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
12	December 15, 2017
13	Jackson, Mississippi
14	APPEARANCES:
15	MR. DARREN J. LAMARCA
16	MR. PATRICK LEMON Assistant United States Attorneys
17	
18	Representing the Government,
19	United States of America
20	MR. MICHAEL V. CORY, JR.
21	MR. ROBERT JOHNSON Attorneys at Law
22	Representing the Defendant,
23	Carl Reddix
24	COURT REPORTER:
25	Brenda D. Wolverton, RPR, CRR, FCRR Jackson, Mississippi

THE COURT: All right. Mr. LaMarca, will you please call your case?

MR. LAMARCA: Thank you, Your Honor. The matter before the court is United States versus Carl Reddix, Criminal No. 3:16cr50. Mr. Reddix is present in court, Your Honor, with his attorneys, Michael Cory and Robert Johnson, and is present for sentencing as to Count 7 to which he pled guilty of the indictment.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel, will you come up with your client, please? Good morning.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning.

THE COURT: Just to reset a little bit, we obviously started this process before. There were questions regarding the forfeiture amount. I asked the parties to do some additional briefing on that. When I ruled on that issue, there was another issue that appeared to me. I therefore asked the parties to address it. I have now ruled on the forfeiture issue. We will take up the other issue in a minute, but I think that we are ready to proceed. Mr. Cory, are you ready to proceed?

MR. CORY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to start from the beginning because I think that's probably the safest thing to do. Dr. Reddix, let me ask you did you have a chance to review the presentence report and the addendum with your attorneys?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 2 THE COURT: Okay. And did you have a chance to ask 3 them any questions you might have about what those documents 4 say? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Definitely. Yes. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Were they able to answer your 7 questions for you? 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I didn't like all the answers. 9 THE COURT: I can understand that, but you understood 10 the answers? I did. 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: Is there anything about the presentence 12 report or the addendum that you do not understand? 13 14 THE DEFENDANT: No, sir. 15 THE COURT: All right. And I'm sorry. Mr. Johnson, 16 who is taking the lead here this morning? It has been Mr. 17 Cory, but --MR. CORY: I will this morning. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. Would you agree that you have had 20 an opportunity to go through the presentence report with your client and that he does understand what it says? 21 22 MR. CORY: Yes, sir. 23 THE COURT: Okay. There was a motion filed this 24 morning. I assume there is no objection to the motion. 25 that right?

MR. CORY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I will just -- without closing the record, I will just say for the record that I have considered the motion. I think it's well-taken and it is granted.

All right. There is also an objection with respect to the loss amount. Dr. Reddix, if you like, you can return to your seat at this point. I will just hear from the attorneys.

MR. CORY: Your Honor, would you like me to address that issue briefly?

THE COURT: Please.

MR. CORY: Your Honor, the court brought I guess -- we have submitted a brief and objection to the 2C1.1 calculation of the loss amount of \$2.5 million and ask that this court reduce that for sentencing purposes by Mr. Reddix's 50 percent ownership interest in Health Assurance to approximately \$1.2 million. I don't have any additional arguments to make that aren't reflected in the brief and objection we submitted, but we would ask the court to consider that objection and make an appropriate ruling.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask you this. Both parties cited *United States v. Bankston*, and it seems like that case does sort of square up the issue in terms of factual question of whether or not the defendant was acting on his own behalf or as an agent for, in this case, Health Assurance, LLC. Would you agree that that's sort of the factual question I need

to resolve?

MR. CORY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And do you wish to put on any evidence with respect to that issue?

MR. CORY: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is there anything further?

MR. CORY: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. LaMarca?

MR. LAMARCA: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, we do stand by our response to the court's order. We do agree with the court that the issue is whether distilled factually for this case the issue being whether the defendant was acting as an agent for Health Assurance.

I would submit to the court that there is one additional factual issue that I am not sure if the court is aware but I want to present it to the court. If the defendant disagrees with it, then we are prepared to put on some testimony.

If the court may look to Paragraph 35 on Page 20 of the PSR, it would be towards the end of that paragraph where in the Title III conversation the defendant states that I will go back and talk to Hattie to be sure, but, like I said, that part ain't never had an issue. They were discussing at this moment whether the funds would be available for Mr. Epps as part of

the counting and the money from the contract that's going to Health Assurance.

THE COURT: I think I just found it. That's a really long paragraph.

MR. LAMARCA: It is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Page 20?

2.4

MR. LAMARCA: Yes, sir. Page 20 about three or four paragraphs from Paragraph 36.

THE COURT: And who is Hattie?

MR. LAMARCA: Hattie is an accounting bookkeeper for Health Assurance. And if the court will see that on Paragraph 44, there was an interview of the defendant back on October 30th. And during that interview, the defendant, although not recounted in the PSR, the defendant explained that Hattie is Hattie Armstrong, an employee with Health Assurance, and was aware and assisted the defendant in finding ways to come up with the cash; that the defendant would, with Ms. Hattie, find receipts for items purchased with cash so that the receipts could be used to cover up where the cash was spent.

And I say this to the court factually that these things if they are accepted by the court as being true show that the funds that were actually being paid for the bribes and kickbacks were hidden, concealed, through the efforts of receipts and originate from Health Assurance.

So I think that's an additional factor other than what was legally explained in our brief to the court with regard to the different purposes of forfeiture, what's foreseeable in the sentencing guidelines and for sentencing purposes. So we stand by that. And we also wanted to present to the court that factual distinction. And, as I said, if the defendant disagrees with what I have said, we are prepared to put on proof to that effect.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Is there anything else?

MR. LAMARCA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cory, I will let you respond to that.

MR. CORY: Yes, sir. We don't -- the defendant does not dispute that funds -- that certain funds that were used to pay the kickbacks to Mr. Epps came from Health Assurance. I would clarify. I do think the dispositive issue before the court is whether he was acting as an agent. But in the Bankston case, they used the term -- they referred to RICO enterprise liability and joint enterprise and whether it was an individual bribe, and then they referenced back to the fact that the expected benefit to receive -- to be received under 2C1.1 is the benefit to the actual payer of the bribe.

A distinguishing feature in my mind at least is that in the *Bankston* case, the other owners of the company were not involved in any way and the bribes were still individual

between the recipient of the bribe and the payer of the bribe even though it benefited the company as a whole. It was not a joint enterprise. So I think that is a distinguishing feature, but we don't disagree that the money or at least some of the money came out of Health Assurance funds.

THE COURT: Okay. Anything else?

MR. CORY: No, sir.

THE COURT: All right. Give me just one minute.

(SHORT PAUSE)

THE COURT: All right. The objection is overruled. The presentence report calculates the loss amount based on the profits to Health Assurance, LLC. And initially all the parties were in agreement with that calculation. When I looked at the arguments regarding forfeiture, it occurred to me that the defendant might be able to make an argument that the analysis regarding forfeiture might also apply to the calculation of loss amount. It's obviously my objective in every case to make sure that the guidelines are correctly calculated, and I take that responsibility seriously, so I asked the parties to brief it.

The relevant section of the guidelines is 2C1.1(b) which addresses a specific offense characteristic. In Subpart 2 it states that if the benefit received or to be received in return for the payment exceeded \$6,500, then you increase by the number of levels in Table 2B1.1.

The issue here is whether or not that term, benefits received, should be defined as benefits received personally by the defendant. The defendant was a 50 percent owner of Health Assurance, and so he would have received 50 percent of the profit of the over \$2.5 million. Application Note 3 states that loss for purposes of Section (b)(2) shall be determined in accordance with Application Note 3 of the commentary to Section 2B1.1. So if you look at that application note, it states that actual loss means the reasonably foreseeable pecuniary harm that resulted from the offense. It then defines that term to mean pecuniary harm that the defendant knew or under the circumstances reasonably should have known was a potential result of the offense.

These passages do not directly answer the question whether the term, benefits received, means personally received, but they certainly suggest that it is broader than what the defendant personally pocketed when it defines loss as pecuniary harm and talks about potential result of the offense. That said, both parties have focused on United States v. Bankston, 182 F.3d 296, which is a Fifth Circuit case from 1999. And in that case there was a similar issue in the context of a RICO case where the defendant had bribed a legislator to avoid passing certain laws that would regulate video poker businesses, and the loss amount was determined to be 50 percent -- I'm sorry -- the defendant's 50 percent interest

in that company.

The government filed a cross appeal in that case saying that the ownership percentage of the defendant should not have reduced the loss amount and specifically contended that the court erred in limiting the term, benefit, as used in 2C1.1(b)(2)(A) to personal benefit.

As I noted earlier, it appears that the case came down to the question of who is the payer. And on that question the Fifth Circuit said there is a question of whether the defendant paid the bribes individually or as the agent for the larger company. And the Fifth Circuit concluded that that's a fact question and it found that the record evidence in that case was sufficient to support the district court's conclusion that the bribes were paid individually and not as an agent and therefore the payer in that case was the defendant himself individually.

Looking at agency principals then agency is a relationship which results from the manifestation of consent by one person to another that the other shall act on his behalf and subject to his control and consent. In this case it seems fairly obvious to me that Dr. Reddix as the 50 percent owner of Health Assurance, LLC, and as its manager would exercise both actual and apparent authority on behalf of Health Assurance, LLC.

It's also apparent from the recordings of the conversations between Dr. Reddix and Mr. Epps that Dr. Reddix

was initially paying Epps bribes to maintain Health Assurance's contracts. Later in the recordings, specifically Paragraph 31, the defendant talks about getting bids and is discussing the clinic as a whole, not just himself but what the clinic would do and how Mr. Epps would help the clinic keep his contracts and gain other contracts.

I would also say based on what I have heard today which was information that was not available to me before that if the question is who is the payer and the evidence now shows that Dr. Reddix was working in conjunction with somebody in an accounting capacity at Health Assurance to hide these payments and if the payments themselves were actually coming from Health Assurance, then it appears to me that Health Assurance is the payer. I just don't think that you can say from the nature of this scheme that he paid those bribes just for himself or his own benefit. It was to prop up the company that he owned and managed, and obviously the benefits of those contracts enured not only to him but also to Health Assurance itself.

It's also apparent to me and it seems relevant that Dr. Reddix was not the only person associated with Health Assurance that was involved in this scheme. We have the information today that's not disputed that the accounting department was involved in it, too. I'm also aware that Robert Simmons was involved in bribes related to Health Assurance's contracts on the coast.

Based on all of that, it appears to me that the presentence report was correctly calculated all along, and the objection is therefore denied. You can come back up.

All right. I'm sorry. Dr. Reddix, I need you to come back up, too. Counsel, I will start with the government. It appears that the maximum term of incarceration is not more than 10 years. Based on the motion that I did grant today, the offense level is 30, Criminal History Category is a I, and the guideline range of imprisonment is 97 to 120 months. Does the government agree?

MR. LAMARCA: Yes, Your Honor.

2.4

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Cory, based on my rulings today, do you agree with those guidelines calculations?

MR. CORY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Dr. Reddix, when you entered your plea, I told you that you would have an opportunity to tell me anything that you wanted me to know before the sentence is imposed, and I mentioned then that you could speak for yourself or have your attorney speak for you or both, but now is your opportunity to exercise that right.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Well, let me just --

MR. CORY: Judge, our plan this morning was to call one character witness and then have Mr. Robert Johnson make a brief argument with respect to our sentencing request and then have Mr. Reddix allocute.

1 THE COURT: That's fine with me. Did you want to call 2 your witness? 3 MR. CORY: Yes, sir. You can sit down. Dr. Reddix would call Mr. Walter Johnson. 4 5 WALTER JOHNSON, 6 having first been duly sworn, testified as follows: 7 DIRECT EXAMINATION 8 BY MR. CORY: 9 Good morning. 10 Α Good morning. Mr. Johnson, would you tell the court your full name and 11 address, residence address? 12 Walter Johnson, 124 Hickory Glen, Madison, Mississippi. 13 Α 14 And where do you currently work? Q 15 I work for the law firm of Watkins & Eager here in Jackson. 16 And how long have been at Watkins & Eager? 0 17 Α Since 1990. And briefly what's the nature of your practice? 18 0 19 I represent the medical community in Mississippi and I 20 represent Pfizer across the country and I represent Bayer 21 across the country. 22 Mr. Johnson, how long have you known Carl Reddix? 23 I met Carl -- I have known of Carl for many years but -- by 24 reputation, but I met him around 1992, '93. 25 And how did you come to know Mr. Reddix?

- I was a young lawyer, and Carl and a Dr. Paul Rice were 1 Α 2 involved in a piece of litigation against -- as well as Hinds 3 General Hospital which is now I think called Merit Hospital, and we ended up trying a lawsuit. Carl and Dr. Rice were both 4 5 It was a pretty dangerous case. I think the acquitted. 6 verdict ended up being around 2 million or \$3 million, it's 7 been a long time, against the hospital. And we became friends 8 after that. And actually my business grew as a consequence of 9 that trial.
- Now, how did your relationship with Dr. Reddix evolve after 11 that trial?

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Whenever Carl had legal matters related to his profession, he would contact me, and we just became friends.
- Just briefly describe the nature of the friendship. it -- did you go to his house, did you do things like that, or was it more professional?
  - It was both personal and professional, but I think I have been to Carl's house one time in my life, and we didn't, you know, go out together or anything like that but we communicated pretty regular. We talked about ideas, politics, family, those kind of things.
  - Do you have any personal knowledge of Carl's interest in public health and healthcare, prison healthcare, those types of things?
- 25 I do. Carl is an interesting man. He is most intelligent,

very well educated. He went to Tougaloo College. So did I. And so did many African-American physicians in Mississippi as well as lawyers. And Carl left Tougaloo and went to Tufts and got his medical degree behind him from Tufts. Then he went to Johns Hopkins and got his OB/GYN residency completed, and then he went to Harvard in public health. Carl had a public health slant to him and he was concerned about the disparities in healthcare across Mississippi as well as the southeast. And what was your involvement or with Health Assurance itself? Multiple involvements. Carl actually started talking about formulating a company that provided healthcare services to prison inmates. And there were four people. I saw George Terry. He is here today. And there was one other person, Michael Reddix and Carl Reddix. And they put together a business plan, this concept. And they would get together on Tuesdays at like 6:00, 7:00, and somebody would bring a bag of potato chips, some Oreos, a Coca-Cola, and they would sit down and talk about putting this thing together, which they did successfully. And do you know why Dr. Reddix wanted to do that? Well, I think in large part, and Carl can probably tell you Α about this probably better than I, but Carl came from a family

that was service oriented. And I think really that kind of

under-rode everything. But Carl was concerned about just the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

healthcare disparities that poor people received,

African-Americans received, and his entire life has been

dedicated to providing health services and just general care to

poor people. That's what he has done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

He left New England. He came back to Mississippi in the early nineties. And when he got here, he ended up having to pay back some time doing some public service and I think he worked for Jackson Hinds Comprehensive Clinic. He worked over in Rankin County, government clinic, Madison County. And he had a short term to pay back. But Reddix continued to work at Jackson Hinds for most of his career that he did obstetrics. think he delivered babies for about 15 years and then he moved into other things but continued his GYN practice. reason he stayed at Jackson Hinds is because they didn't have a doctor that did OB/GYN. When Carl first came here, there were actually three African-American private practitioners that delivered babies to people who had Medicaid, just poor people, people who had no insurance. Paul Rice, Carl Reddix and I think Freda Bush was the other practitioner. And that's just the environment that he was in, and he -- he gave of himself in that regard.

- Q Mr. Johnson, do you know anything about Dr. Reddix's relationship with Christopher Epps?
- A Only what I have read. I mean to be honest with you, I knew nothing about Carl's relationship with Christopher Epps.

And when it did come to light to me --

Q I was going to ask you how did you find out the situation that Carl finds himself in today?

A I was at my office and Carl called me middle of the day and said he needed to talk to me right away. And he came by the office and he had had an interview with the FBI. They had invited him down to their offices for some reason other than We need to talk to you about Chris Epps, and they kind of revealed to him I guess some of the better evidence that they had. And Carl had a candid conversation with them and answered every question.

And he came and talked to me, and I'm not a criminal defense lawyer. What I know about criminal law or criminal procedure you can put in a thimble. And so I ended up getting another lawyer involved and Charlene Priester is a good friend of mine who I respect her judgment, and I invited her over. She knew Carl. And we tried to help figure out how to get him some help.

- Q What was your personal reaction?
- A I was shocked because I have known Carl a long time but I didn't know anything about his involvement with Chris Epps.

  And I would never have imagined that we would be sitting here today discussing the things that we are talking about. I just wouldn't have imagined it because of the Carl Reddix I knew.
- Q I want to talk to you briefly about the Carl Reddix you

knew before that and the Carl you know today. What are the characteristics that you see in Carl that you would want the court to consider or know about in formulating its sentence today?

A This whole incident is really out of character for Carl Reddix. I don't know how long it went on, but I would have bet you -- if you had bet me a million dollars that I would be sitting here having this conversation with you, I would have taken your bet and I would have given you odds against him because of who this guy is. Reddix has always been a very proud man. He has always cared about his reputation. And he has given more to people than I can even begin to tell you.

I mean I will tell you one of my early remembrances of Carl is we had just starting doing business with each other as far as health legal matters, and Carl was in the Wal-Mart parking lot. And I drive a pickup truck and he had a pickup truck, and he had bought all these bicycles and he was just going to deliver the bicycles, it was this time of the year, to these churches to distribute to poor children. And that was what he did every Christmas. I mean he bought 30, 40 bicycles. And I don't know if anybody ever knew that Carl did that, but that's the kind of guy that he was.

Intelligent, proud, ambitious and dedicated to education and trying to do -- to help the community that he came from and he lives in. That's the Carl Reddix I knew.

Q Are there any other situations where you saw Carl in a way that you believe more accurately revealed Carl's true character?

A Yes. Any number of things. Carl asked me over the years -- I have gone to Tougaloo College and contributed a little time at Tougaloo because Carl contributed time at Tougaloo. Tougaloo is a historically black college, poor college, survives on private funds for the most part, alumnus. Contributions are not what you find like in other SEC schools, anything like that. And just keeping the lights on at Tougaloo is difficult sometimes.

But Carl started this -- and I won't forget this. He started this entity called the Kincheloe Group, and Kincheloe was the science division or the science building at Tougaloo College. Carl ended up contributing his own personal money, his time. He raised several hundred thousand dollars. And all it was about was trying to encourage kids to study the sciences as well as direct people towards medical school. And he brought in guest speakers to kind of motivate these kids.

And Dr. Richard McGinnis is a Harvard graduate, and he was like the father of Kincheloe chemistry professor. And this I know. Carl contributed to -- personally contributed to Richard McGinnis' salary so that McGinnis could spend more time -- less time teaching and more time trying to continue the relationship that Brown Medical School had with Tougaloo College and to try

- and advance the premed program and get more people involved with it.
  - Q Mr. Johnson, how would you characterize your current relationship with Carl?

- A I consider myself a very close friend of Carl Reddix.
- Q And have you had an opportunity to see him and interact with him since all of this came about?
- A I have. And I have talked to him regularly. And the -the Carl Reddix I guess in comparison to the Carl Reddix

  pre-Epps, Carl is still the same man in many ways in that he is
  still involved with giving of himself. He is less prideful.

  He is a little more humble.

And I will never forget the day that Carl came over and told me about this whole incident and we got a lawyer involved for him. Carl was ashamed of himself because, you know, Carl let himself down, he let a lot of people down, a lot of people that really respected him. And I think he will always carry that with him. Carl is ashamed of what he has done, and he will always be ashamed of it.

- Q Mr. Johnson, what are your personal views about what Carl has to give to the community when this is all finally behind him?
- A Well, I think -- I know that Carl will always contribute to his community. There are some things he might not be able to do anymore. Carl has been a significant factor in this medical

community particularly as it relates to healthcare to African-Americans. And he is not going to be able to do that anymore. Carl has lost his career. He has lost his standing in the medical community. He has -- his reputation both inside Mississippi and outside Mississippi in that he does have a very wide network of friends. I think that that's been blemished.

But about three weeks ago I went over to Reddix -- an office that Reddix was in, and he had convened a group of people. And what he was working on and he will continue to work on this, I'm sure, but as a consequence of him doing this prison medicine, Carl had the idea that a lot of the young men that are in college sports that act out and that have all these issues that college football players have demonstrated over the last few years, that in many regards many of those young kids have some of the same issues that inmates have, a large percentage of them do, probably could use some mental health guidance, they could use some life coaching. And that's kind of what he has been working on in the last few months. And he is not making any money on that, I mean, but it is just some programs that he is trying to get instituted in colleges.

I think Carl will always be involved. I think he will be involved with healthcare although he won't be able to practice medicine because that's who he is. I mean I think that's part of his nature.

Q Mr. Johnson, is there anything else you would like to tell

```
1
     the court that you haven't already said in determining its
2
     sentence?
3
                I would like to ask the court to be lenient on Carl
         I do.
4
     Reddix. I'm asking that you be merciful to be honest with you.
5
     I mean the guy has lost everything. I now understand that he
6
     is responsible for a two and a half million dollar forfeiture.
7
     And he has been ruined financially, and I think that he has
8
     suffered tremendously as a consequence of all of this. And I
9
     would ask that you take that into consideration with your
10
     sentencing. And essentially that's all I have to say, Your
11
     Honor.
              MR. CORY: Your Honor, I don't have any further
12
13
     questions.
14
              THE COURT: Any cross?
15
              MR. LAMARCA: Your Honor, the government has no
16
     questions.
17
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Mr. Johnson, you
18
     can step down.
19
              MR. CORY: Your Honor, at this time I would like to
20
     turn over the podium to my cocounsel.
              THE COURT: Certainly.
21
22
              MR. JOHNSON: Good morning.
23
              THE COURT: Good morning.
24
              MR. JOHNSON: May it please the court? Judge, I don't
25
     know a whole lot more I can add. Sentencing, as you are well
```

aware, my forte is arguing closing arguments so I would respectfully ask that you -- well, be patient with me. I won't argue outside the guidelines. But I would like to talk about this in terms of a perspective that -- in keeping with Booker where it talks about -- I'm asking in this argument for a departure from the guidelines. And so when I think about that, I think about who Carl Reddix is. And I have a perspective as his lawyer and in my other vocation as a legislator. And part of what Booker talks about in talking about a departure in the heartland sentencing venue, what they talk about is how -- how -- how is he different from other defendants in this case.

I would begin to say that when I look at Carl Reddix, I am not only his lawyer but I am also his friend. And what I know about him is that everything about this case starts with service. Carl Reddix grew up in Mississippi and was smart enough to do anything he wanted to do. He chose a profession that arguably is probably the highest calling of service that you could have. He chose to be a doctor. He left here, went to school and chose to come back, and I would venture to say arguably that serving as a doctor in Mississippi is probably the highest calling of service as a doctor you can have. And so when I looked at the other defendants in this case and I looked at what they did, they were either intermediaries or they were people who essentially were in the business of corrections for profit or for a way -- an inventive way to make

money.

Carl Reddix got involved in health medicine at the request of the Hinds County Sheriff who needed help in a jail where they were not meeting the corrections audit, where people were sick and dying in jail and they needed doctors who were willing to come in and do something. These were two young doctors that decided to do that.

Let me make a point that these were doctors who got involved and Carl Reddix was a doctor who got involved in corrections medicine before Chris Epps was any more than a guard at Parchman. So for 10 years. And by the time any of the salient things that happened in this case happened, for 10 years and upwards of 15 years, Carl Reddix was doing corrections medicine in an exemplary way without any interruption, without any shakedown from anybody, doing his job with exemplary marks from everybody.

So when I talk about and I make this argument about why there is a difference and why there should be a departure, here is a man who committed his life to service and committed his profession to service and committed his effort in corrections medicine as a way of service. And we talk about this two and a half million dollars, and if you look at the accounting and if you look at the numbers, there was no profit in Health Assurance. Health Assurance operated essentially at a loss. That's because every bid that Carl Reddix made was

either half or much lower than any other bid that was bid on these projects. And he never paid a dime to get any information early, and there was no record of it, there is nothing on the tapes that suggest that, that he got any advantage in bidding. He simply made his bid based on the work and the hard work that he did.

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you on that. I thought the PSR included a conversation where he was discussing a competitor's bid with Epps and in an effort to essentially block that bid.

MR. JOHNSON: And I'm not here to argue with the That conversation took place after the bidding court. No. process had taken place and a discussion was essentially about what the other bidders -- the information they didn't have as a result of coming to the bidders conference where the information was provided.

THE COURT: I mean had the contract been awarded at that point?

> MR. JOHNSON: Had the contract been awarded to? THE COURT: At the point of that conversation.

MR. JOHNSON: No, the contract had not been awarded, but there was no information about what bids and what the price on the bids were.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. JOHNSON: But all of that aside, Your Honor, my

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

perspective also is that when all of this began and took place, I remember back in 2007 when Carl Reddix had been in the corrections business now for over 11 years. In 2007, Carl came to the legislature complaining about the fact that Chris Epps wanted to force him to pay somebody to come and lobby for him to have a contract and he didn't feel the need to do that. And the record will reflect that he went to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor and eventually got to the Speaker of the House where there was a conversation that was had.

I was in that meeting. When that meeting was over with, we were able to convince Mr. Epps that he needed to let Dr. Reddix do his work and leave him alone. And that was the end of that. Five years later what I hear is that Chris Epps who is now the Chairman of the National Corrections Association and Dr. Reddix had bid and won a contract with two of the worst facilities in the state, he finds himself after going to the people in charge, the people who were the oversight for Chris Epps, and none of them did anything, found himself in a position where Mr. Epps told him that the contracts that he had already been awarded and won that he did not receive any information about that he won because he was the lowest and best bid that he had to pay him in order to keep those contracts.

And so I would assert that I got involved in this to help him fight this issue, but this is not a jurisdiction where

shakedown or extortion is recognized as a defense. And so Dr. Reddix pled guilty because that was the only fight that was left there for him. But he never -- he never approached or asked Chris Epps for anything. This was Chris Epps' scheme.

2.4

And I understand that culture. I know that culture because Cecil McCrory is a former legislator, Irb Benjamin is a former legislator, and what they know is You scratch my back, I will scratch yours. Carl Reddix doesn't know that culture. What Carl Reddix knows is that If I do my job, I do it in an excellent fashion, I do everything that I am supposed to do, I meet all the requirements that the contract asks me to meet, then that should be enough. And that had been enough up until 2012. That had been enough up until 2007.

So when I stand here and ask the court to be lenient and make a departure, I think about the person who started this whole process because he was interested in service. I look at the person, an educator like Ms. Dillon who lives in Columbia that talks about the fact he would drive three hours and come down to talk to people in a rural community about -- women about their healthcare and assert that she doesn't know how many people whose lives he may have saved and prevented from having cancer or some other debilitating disease because they understood, educated in a medical sense about things they would otherwise not know.

I think about young doctors like Dr. McShan and Dr.

Wadell who came to this city interested in practicing medicine and had nobody to help them. He in some cases reached in his pocket to help them with expenses to get them going. Dr. Wadell tells the story of being a doctor in this town that had nobody, didn't know anybody, and Dr. Reddix came to his aid and told him he would help him.

And a young medical student who Carl knew from college, Dr. Billups, who found their self 1600 miles away from home in a hospital in Boston not knowing -- in Rhode Island not knowing anybody, not having anybody, and Carl in the middle of his medical studies found a way to go check on her and make sure that his former fellow student from Tougaloo was doing okay.

And I look at a person who understood the value and the service of being involved in the Boy Scouts and how it was important to bridge that gap in the community to help young African-American boys who otherwise wouldn't ever have that ability to deal with any of those issues and rise to the status of being chairman of that organization.

This is a fraction of the kind of things a person would do that he otherwise -- that other people wouldn't do. I look at and I listened to hours of these tapes where he was talking to Chris Epps. I know Chris Epps. And I know what that was. I was in a meeting where they almost came to blows. Chris Epps was not a friend of Carl Reddix but Chris Epps was a

man, was a bully, was a man who demanded a certain amount of attention, demanded a certain amount of gravitas from people, and Carl Reddix gave him that. He didn't give him that to gain an advantage on contracts, he didn't give him that to defraud the State of Mississippi; he gave him that in an effort to maintain his ability to continue to provide the service he was providing to people in prison.

People in prison are the only people in the country who have a constitutional right to healthcare. In the State of Mississippi, they were being sued by the federal government and everybody because they were not providing that healthcare. Health Assurance and Carl Reddix did that. It's different from a person who was an intermediary for a major company or a lobbyist for a company and going to Chris Epps and taking bribes in order to get contracts. That's not who Carl Reddix was.

Carl Reddix is the only co-owner of a business that has been indicted in this case. Irb Benjamin, Cecil McCrory, all represented companies, and none of those companies, none of those CEOs have appeared in this court or in any federal court or been indicted in any way. Carl Reddix was here, a Mississippian providing a service, doing his job. And but for the fact that Chris Epps came and essentially instituted a shakedown, he would have continued to be doing business today.

This is in no way in an effort to absolve himself of

responsibility. I'm telling you as his lawyer Carl Reddix accepted responsibility. He knew he did wrong. He knows he has done wrong. But the service he has provided to this community and the service he can continue to provide is immeasurable.

And, Judge, I would just offer this. Here is a man as Walter Johnson said who has lost his career, over 25 years of practicing medicine, has lost his ability to make money in any way, has lost all of his savings, his reputation, the damage it has done to his family, his children, his mother, his wife.

One thing that Booker recognized, Gall recognized, is that at some point what is important is whether or not there is punishment. And I would assert that Carl Reddix has been punished, that any more punishment is not necessary. And so I would ask the court respectfully for a departure, a departure from the guidelines that would show mercy and would recognize the fact that Carl Reddix has paid the price. Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. CORY: Judge, at this time Mr. Reddix -- Dr. Reddix is ready to give his allocution.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, Judge. Let me just start by saying this is the absolute hardest thing I have ever done, and I thank the two Johnsons and Mr. Cory and Ms. Ross for excellent counsel.

Just briefly just to answer a question that you asked of Robert about what you saw in the pretrial report, it was historical data that Mr. Epps was conferring. Not all of our contracts were bid, prepared and turned in all at the same time, so there is no way that anything that -- there is no way anybody would know. Anyway, I take full responsibility for what I did, and I, without question, gave kickbacks to Mr. Epps.

I'm sorry that I have brought my family, my friends, my patients especially and my peers through this ordeal, and I have to tell you that I am a better person now than I was, and I'm not bitter. I am a better person because of the love, the understanding and forgiveness that these people that I have just named and most of whom are here have blessed me to enjoy.

Again, I'm here because I gave kickbacks to

Christopher Epps in prison contracts as he demanded. It was

wrong each time I did it. I paid him in cash and I never told

anyone that I was giving him any money, including my closest

confidantes. And, for the most part, I didn't tell my wife. I

didn't tell my wife. I didn't tell my brother. I didn't tell

anybody. I didn't tell Robert. I didn't tell Walter. And I

talked to all of them very, very often.

I regret that decision, and I will live with those consequences of that decision for the rest of my life.

As has been stated, I have sacrificed a lot so far in

my estimation. Most germane to me, and I will apologize again because all of this is so hard for me, but, you know, the most important right that I have sacrificed are voting rights. I last voted in the mayoral election in the primary but I was not able to vote in the general election because I had entered a guilty plea and was not eligible to vote. I equate --

THE COURT: Quiet, please.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm good. I equate voting rights to civil rights and racial disparity and health. They are just a synonym for voting rights in my estimation.

The other thing that I have lost is my medical license that I have earned after spending 13 years after high school and becoming a gynecologist and a public healther. I am proud that I had an opportunity to go to -- that I went to America's best college, Tougaloo College, and three of America's best medical institutions. If I had stayed in Mississippi and gone to medical school, which I could have in 1984, I would not have been able to be a gynecologist because in the State of Mississippi they didn't train African-American gynecologists until the year 2000. So, in order to get what I got, I had to leave.

I lost my license because of my -- because of the guilty plea, and the reason was moral turpitude. I had to look up turpitude. I didn't know what that meant to tell you the truth. I also lost my American Board of OB/GYN certification

that I had had since I got back and all of my high school privileges and everything associated with the practice of medicine that had nothing to do with the practice of medicine.

2.4

I lost my practice that I started in 1989. I had to leave. Thankfully they welcomed me back and I still can sit in my office and read. I bankrupted a prize company that we built, as Walter was saying, on an idea, a need and what I felt was a responsibility. And, as a result of that, the bankruptcy, one of our vendors, a family-owned business, pharmacy business in Alabama, we owed a lot of money. We owed over a million dollars to. And I hate that and I take responsibility for that as well.

Part of that is because the state didn't pay us all of the money that they don't argue that they owe, and we -- it's just one of those things as a result of all of the consequences of my action without question.

I have lost my civic leadership positions in iconic organizations that I had worked tirelessly for to ensure that they had represented themselves fully in my community and communities that look like mine, like the Boy Scouts and the Mississippi Symphony Orchestra. I was the president of the Boy Scout Board in 2006 and '7 and have worked throughout our council, and I know that I was a regular and frequent persona for that organization.

And the symphony orchestra, I helped them to get

inside the -- because they didn't have entree into Jackson

State and Alcorn's music departments to help get their students

fully accessed to what the Mississippi Symphony Orchestra does

with their professional musicians.

I would like for you to understand that I have earned every opportunity I have ever been afforded. My advisers when I was in Boston and Baltimore didn't understand why it was important to me to come back home. It was important because somebody had to do it. And I had been afforded an excellent educational pedigree and I looked very much to sharing all that I had learned.

I want the court to know that I would be the first to admit that I have lived a very privileged life. No silver spoons. My parents were public school teachers in a small town in Mississippi. No gifts. No set-asides. My hard work afforded me opportunity for, as I said, an excellent academic pedigree, a chance to get to know the best and brightest people in the world. And when I say best and brightest, it has nothing to do with educational attainment. Some of my best friends have not even gone to college. And most importantly, my hard work has allowed me the opportunity to participate in the bettering of people's lives, especially women and people of color, and I took that very seriously.

I have never compromised the practice of medicine or the management of medicine. I always put the needs of my

patients and my inmates before my own. And since I have been afforded such, so much, I have been striving my entire life to give back more than I take.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I care about prison medicine for two reasons. you are going to be an entertainer, you want to be in New York and be around other people so you can learn and get better. medicine, you want to be around the worst so you can help them and do the most good. And since the people in the corrections environment look like me in a significantly disproportionate way, at least 80 percent, it was important to me that somebody like me, well-trained and committed, start talking to you about Mr. Epps. And I won't bore you with a lot of things you have already heard, but I think it is important to know that especially with the meeting that Mr. Johnson was talking about in early January 2007 when Epps demanded that I hire a specific lobbyist to help with our Walnut Grove contract that we had had for six years at that point, I told him no and meant no. went on a long rant and he cussed me, threatened to take the Walnut Grove contract and call every sheriff in the State of Mississippi and demand that they do not do any business with That's why I had solicited Robert's help as a legislator to go to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Speaker to seek help.

And again, to my knowledge, the Governor or Lieutenant Governor didn't do anything. The Speaker convened us in his

office and tried to settle the dispute. Epps told the Speaker who had just had a stroke and was frail that the Speaker nor the other state's highest officeholders could tell him how to run his agency. The speaker turned red and chastised him, and eventually he calmed down, and he told the Speaker that he could work with Dr. Reddix as long as Dr. Reddix understood who the tallest horse at the trough was. A shallow victory.

But I have to tell you that, as Robert touched on, one of the hardest things other than this, and this is definitely harder, but the second hardest is not fighting, physically fighting Epps for throwing his hand in my chest as he was looking at the Speaker when he said those words and I needed to understand he was the tallest horse at the trough. It was the only time in my life that I wanted to fight. I have never had a fistfight.

Now fast forward to 2012, Fall of 2012, when Mr. Epps came to me after we were working at the East Mississippi prison contract and the Marshall County contract, but mostly all of our conversations centered around East contract because of the heinous conditions we had inherited. Shortly after startup we were having status conferences at the Department of Corrections because things were so bad. We were trying our best to right this ship as quickly as possible. And sometime in that timeframe during that meeting or one-on-one after one of those status conferences, he came to me and he told me that he

required \$2,000 per month per contract or he would assure that our invoices would be significantly delayed. And unfortunately I agreed to those terms.

My lawyers have tried to get me to explain the details of that meeting. And, honestly, Judge, I don't remember it. I blocked it. I have had a few traumatic events in my life but none that I have blocked. For example, in '77 when I was in college, I stood between two men who were fighting and one who pulled a gun and was about to shoot another guy, and I stood between them. I can tell you everything about it.

I can remember in 1987 my wife and I, residents in Baltimore, we had carbon monoxide poisoning, came within inches of dying. I can give you a blow-by-blow of every event that happened that day. Or in 1988 when my son, six months old, had pneumococcal meningitis and almost died. I can tell you about the phonecall that my mother made about my father's colon cancer. He eventually died. Or I can tell you all about my mother-in-law's stroke when my father-in-law called and talked to me to tell my wife that her mother had had a major stroke and to come home. I can tell you everything about it.

I can tell you everything about my brother's diagnosis and where I was when we talked and I heard. I can tell you everything about my FBI interview. But I can't tell you anything about the particulars of exactly what he said, Epps said, that made me agree to start paying the kickbacks. I

don't know. I can tell you my moral compass was traumatized somewhere away from true north.

2.4

Through a lifetime of challenges, growing up in a transitioning Mississippi in the sixties, integrating two public schools and a Catholic church and then coming back to try and be a leader in our community, especially around healthcare, I have had plenty tests of character. I have never failed. This mental block is obviously protecting my conscious brain, and I have never had memory loss this profound that I cannot remember anything about it.

Sir, I have to tell you that while Epps may on some of these recordings talk about doing something to be helpful, our proposals were the lowest and the best bids on each of the contracts that we were granted. In fact, specifically around the time that I had met with Epps and this demand had been given, Epps -- we as a company had drawn down about \$700,000 on our \$1 million line of credit that we had gotten years earlier for glitches and reimbursements from public institutions. So I know that what I was feeling was stress from overwhelming financial exposure, and I knew that with the front-end costs that we had expended that we would not -- we would not be profitable on that contract and it would take us years to recoup those front-end costs. So I know we were feeling pressure.

But the other part of that timeframe is that Mr. Epps

was at that point in time the most powerful man in corrections. He was President of the American Correctional Association and he was President of all of the State Prison Chiefs. Everybody seemed to bow down and kiss his ring. And because I had witnessed how he talked to the Speaker and the disdain that he had for the oversight from state government, I'm sure that that played a significant part.

I can in addition tell you that I had seen how Mr. Epps was treated by his deputy commissioners and all of his staff. They all called him boss. They never called him Mr. Epps. They rarely called him commissioner. They all called him boss when they were in his presence. I was always amused by their interactions, and my patronizing name to him was bossman. And whenever he asked about his payments, I always said, I got you. These conversations were chummy by design. His ego required it. He was a quintessential narcissist.

Our relationship, however, when not talking about business really was locker room talk because we had very little in common. And, in fact, he is probably one of the few, probably the only black man in Central Mississippi that I had absolutely no friends in common with. I can't say that about too many people.

Working toward closure, and this is going to be the hardest part, as I have done earlier, I want to thank the court and apologize to the court for kickbacks, and I want to

apologize to my family, my mother, wife, brother, my children, I'm putting them through hell, too. I want to my nieces. thank my patients and apologize to them. I thank all my My church members are here. My priest is here. My peers are here. My former employees are here. I thank all of them, but I especially thank them for the volumes of letters that they have sent to you addressed to you. I owe them all so I have grown so much. Again, I am a better person, not much. a bitter person, all as a result of the angelic wings that all of you allowed me to ride. I'm humbled and happy to have had all of the life connections that I have been afforded. this is over, I promise I will do everything in my power to devote myself to this community who stood by me so steadfastly. I love them all.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I tell you, Judge, as you can see behind me, there are a lot of men here. I am a gynecologist. You would think I would have a lot of women. And, you know, I have never been told I love you by the volumes of men that I have been told who I have had the bear hugs and the embraces have been important.

There is one promise I want to make to you. The probity and rectitude that has always guided my true north will be my lighthouse that it has historically been, but for this one transgression. I am very confident that you will and have considered all of the submissions and the facts in my particular case, and I'm confident that you will be imminently

fair with whatever my final judgment is. Thank you so much.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. You mentioned the letters. Of course, I have received a lot of letters. I have read them. I have had them scanned. They will be received into the record at this point.

Mr. LaMarca, do you have any argument on behalf of the government?

MR. LAMARCA: Your Honor, we do stand behind our recommendation that we have made in the plea supplement, the recommendation being 84 months or the lower 25 percent of the guideline range, whichever is lower. We make that recommendation based upon consideration by the United States Attorney's Office of the sentences and as well as the conduct of all other people involved in the Epps corruption matter. So we make that recommendation based upon that.

We do want to also as part of that recommendation let the court know that there were other people that were involved with Mr. Epps on behalf of their own companies and not as a consultant. I mention Mark Longoria to the court who was a CEO of Drug Testing Corporation and actually made bribes and kickbacks to Mr. Epps for contracts to his company and as well as Irb Benjamin on behalf of Mississippi Management Corporation.

I bring those things to the court's attention strictly because it appears that these individuals also attempted to and

did obtain contracts with the state, the Department of Corrections, that is, on behalf of their companies in much the same manner that took place in the instant case before the court.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

With that being said, we do stand by our recommendation. And also we wanted the court to be aware that I had spoken through or to defense counsel. We have filed just several minutes ago a motion to amend the agreed preliminary order of forfeiture. There is a matter of payment of the That motion is filed in an effort to protect and forfeiture. perfect security interests in certain assets of the defendant. The government and defense counsel are attempting to work out arrangements to satisfy that forfeiture, and we intend to work towards having it satisfied by the report date that the court may give or even shortly after that. We will then supply the court with an order at the U.S. Attorney's discretion as to the satisfaction of that forfeiture amount which in essence would be an order satisfying the forfeiture amount and the order of forfeiture that the court has put in place. We wanted the court to be aware that that motion was filed but that there would not be an order forthcoming on that while we attempt to work out --

THE COURT: Wait. Say that part again.

MR. LAMARCA: There would not be an order forthcoming, proposed order to the court for the court to rule on that

motion until the parties have had ample opportunity to discuss fully satisfying that order of forfeiture in a manner that may be less burdensome to all parties involved.

THE COURT: All right. So let me ask you about that. First of all, does it change the amount?

MR. LAMARCA: No, sir.

2.4

THE COURT: I think it's Rule 32. I'm obviously required to enter a preliminary order of forfeiture before sentencing.

MR. LAMARCA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And I'm required to announce the forfeiture as part of the judgment. I have to orally announce it today. So I have never had anybody amend it during the hearing, and I'm not sure procedurally how that works.

MR. LAMARCA: Your Honor, you would have to announce a final order of forfeiture in the amount that the court determined in its order. The amendment of an agreed preliminary order of forfeiture, the motion is filed as to assets of Dr. Reddix as far as substitute assets are concerned.

We do not intend to present the court with an order on that until Dr. Reddix has had an opportunity. It was the government's request that that forfeiture be satisfied today, but through discussions with defense counsel, there are a number of matters that I understand the defendant has to undertake in an effort to satisfy the money judgment. But I

wanted the court to be aware.

2.4

THE COURT: And obviously I haven't seen the motion you are talking about. Does it amend the preliminary order of forfeiture?

MR. LAMARCA: It is a motion to amend the preliminary order of forfeiture.

THE COURT: And you don't anticipate that an order would be entered granting that until after sentencing?

MR. LAMARCA: That would be correct, Your Honor. Now, we understand the court will enter a final order of forfeiture. The motion's purpose was to put defendant and everyone on notice of the assets that the government is aware that the defendant does have.

THE COURT: All right. I'm asking a procedural question.

MR. LAMARCA: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Whether I can enter an order amending a preliminary forfeiture order post judgment.

MR. LAMARCA: I would suggest to the court you could not. I suggest to the court that at the time when an order would have to be entered, an amended motion to substitute assets on the final order of forfeiture would be the proper vehicle within which to enter an order reflecting substitute assets.

THE COURT: And I may be confused, but I thought you

said that the motion that was filed today was to amend the preliminary order.

MR. LAMARCA: That is the way it is couched as we speak considering that that is the only forfeiture order currently in place with the court. There is no final order of forfeiture. There is only an agreed preliminary order of forfeiture pending or actually in place before the court.

THE COURT: I know, but the reason I'm confused, I'm just not following this. I think you just told me that you didn't think I could enter an order amending the preliminary order post judgment, but that's what the motion asks me to do.

MR. LAMARCA: The motion asks the court to amend the agreed preliminary order of forfeiture. That motion may become moot after this hearing today, but it does perfect, I believe, or it does protect the government's notice to the defendant of the assets that the government understands the defendant has and the defendant would be on notice of possible fraud if assets were depleted without the government's consent. That is the purpose of the filing, Your Honor. The motion itself may become moot once the final order of forfeiture is in place, and then we would file a --

THE COURT: I think I'm following you now. Let me hear from Mr. Cory.

MR. CORY: Yes, Your Honor. Dr. Reddix is cooperating and has the intent to cooperate with the government to satisfy

the monetary forfeiture judgment. My understanding, the purpose is exactly what Mr. LaMarca said, which is the money judgment doesn't specify assets. There are a number of assets that are disclosed, and I think the government's concern was simply putting in the record and the world on notice and the defendant on notice that these are the assets we consider potentially substitutable but allowing the defendant the opportunity to orderly liquidate assets.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So there is no request that I rule on that motion at this time and it may be that I am never asked to rule on it. Is that fair?

MR. LAMARCA: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We have been going now for a bit, and I need a little bit of time to pull some notes together.

Is there anything else from either side before we adjourn and I come back and enter judgment? Anything from the government?

MR. LAMARCA: No, Your Honor.

MR. CORY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Court will be in recess for 20 minutes.

(Recess)

THE COURT: All right. As I mentioned, I did receive a number of letters that I read. One of them was from Dr. Andrew Taylor, and he wrote a letter on Dr. Reddix's behalf and he, I think, observed perhaps the obvious, that I face a

difficult task. He is certainly right. Sentencings are always difficult and they are always a weighty decision. I take them serious whether I have a courtroom full of people or if I have a defendant standing there with just his lawyer and nobody else to back him up.

This case is perhaps more difficult because when I look at the record in front of me, in light of Dr. Reddix's history and the seriousness of the crime, it really doesn't make much sense. That said, there are tools under the law to help me reach a just result.

First there are the United States Sentencing

Guidelines which help courts determine the appropriate sentence

based on certain objective factors. Regardless of your race,

age, gender, where you live, how much money you make or other

socioeconomic factors, the guidelines tell us what the

appropriate sentence would be for the certain conduct that was

committed.

In this case, based on the sums of money involved, the guideline range is 97 to 120 months. But, as Mr. Johnson correctly argued, the guideline range is advisory only, so while I must consider the range, I am not required to follow it. Instead, I also have to consider and must follow the factors listed in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). Under that statute the sentence must be sufficient but not greater than necessary to accomplish some very specific goals.

In this case, I address it the same as I do in all cases, and I start with those guidelines and the parties' agreement and I try to decide whether that sentence would satisfy the goals of the statute. Here, the government has recommended a sentence of 84 months. That sentence would be below the sentencing guidelines and therefore represent what's called a variance. The defendant is asking for a more substantial variance and it has been suggested that he should not serve any term of incarceration.

I am going to grant a variance below the government's recommendation, but a sentence without incarceration would not be sufficient to meet the statutory goals. Based primarily on Dr. Reddix's personal history as he and Mr. Johnson recounted it and as reflected in the presentence report, the severity of the offense, the need for deterrence and the need to avoid a disparity with the sentences received by the other defendants, those are the main factors. I will go into them in more detail, but the sentence in this case will be 72 months.

First I look at the nature and circumstances of the offense and the history and characteristics of the defendant. Taking those backwards, I will start with the history and characteristics of the defendant. It's undisputed that he has no criminal history. He is highly educated with degrees from some of the best universities in the country. I also note that after obtaining degrees elsewhere, he did return here. He is

obviously intelligent. He has a long history of civic involvement and leadership.

In addition, I have -- as I have stated, I have received and read well over a hundred letters from his friends and family. And those letters come from people from all walks of life and all demographics. There are people involved in a legal profession, people involved in the medical profession, there are a number of his friends and people he plays golf with and works in Boy Scouts with. There is even a letter from an Assistant United States Attorney, and I don't think I have ever seen that.

It's also remarkable to me how many close personal friends Dr. Reddix has as evidenced today, but also I already had that picture kind of painted from all the letters I had read, and they all paint basically the same picture that Walter Johnson painted when he testified as a man who is generous with his time and his money, who is civically minded and who is deeply involved and willing to help others.

There were a number of themes running through these letters. Almost all of them asked for leniency with some saying that he had accepted responsibility and had cooperated once he was approached by the FBI. Those two factors obviously will be considered and have been considered, and they will impact his sentence.

All of this tells me that he is not your normal

defendant in a sense and that a sentence within the guideline range would not be appropriate under the statute, but they do not suggest that incarceration should not be imposed. begin, the defendant was obviously capable of making an honest and very comfortable living yet starting in 2012 began paying Christopher Epps bribes of \$6,000 per month to obtain or keep contracts with the M.D.O.C. I understand, Mr. Reddix, what you said about that first meeting, and had that one meeting been the only time where there was a transgression, this case would look very different, but the conduct went well past that one day. It was not a one-time thing; it was a once-a-month thing, and the deal grew over time. The defendant was basically paying \$200 per month per contract, so when additional contracts were added, the amount of the kickback went up, eventually reaching nine and a half thousand dollars per month by October of 2014.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Payments were in cash. Dr. Reddix delivered them in person to Mr. Epps. And there is just no way to justify that conduct over that period of time. The meetings with Mr. Epps from July of 2014 through October '14 were all recorded by the FBI which then seized the money Reddix gave Epps during those meetings. The FBI also recorded numerous conversations between the two in which the kickbacks were discussed and showed how Epps helped eliminate competition.

I have also learned today that Dr. Reddix involved

others at Health Assurance to help hide the kickbacks on the books. According to the presentence report, over about a two-year period Dr. Reddix paid Mr. Epps \$187,500 in kickbacks, and that resulted in contracts or related to contracts at an estimated \$32 million. The profits, according to Dr. Reddix's calculations that were submitted in the forfeiture issue, were \$2,532,876.

While in a colloquial sense there could be an argument that this was aberrant behavior, under the guidelines in Section 5K2.20, the planning that was involved, the duration of the scheme, would preclude a departure based on that issue.

So, taking all of this together, I agree that Dr.

Reddix is outside the norm and should receive consideration for his good works, but the scope, extent and nature of this crime are simply too significant to impose an even lower sentence than the one I will enter.

The next thing I have to consider is the sentence must reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law and to provide a just punishment for the offense. As I stated, these kickbacks and the amounts involved were obviously a serious issue that does require just punishment. I also have to make sure under the statute that the sentence affords adequate deterrence for criminal conduct. Public corruption has obviously been a problem in our state and elsewhere. There is no doubt that Epps bullied his way into these deals, but

unfortunately there have been many Chris Epps in our state and there have been many people willing to pay them for whatever reason they may have. And unfortunately I doubt that this will be the last case that we see. All of that undermines the public trust in our government while reducing healthy competition for public services. There is, therefore, in my opinion a substantial need for deterrence.

2.4

I also have to consider whether there is a need to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant, and I see no need in this case in that regard.

I have considered all the factors, but the last one that I'm going to specifically mention is that I am required by statute to make sure that the sentence does not create any unwarranted disparities with other defendants. I think that this is a somewhat significant issue in this case although obviously not the only issue I have considered. As noted, Dr. Reddix is not the only person who was paying kickbacks to Mr. Epps. There were eight related cases.

Just as a matter of fairness, in every case I always try to make sure that the sentence makes sense when I compare it to the sentences received by other defendants. And that's not always easy, because each case in its own sense can be a little bit different. One defendant may be more culpable but cooperated more or may have a criminal history. All these things have to be considered.

In this case, Mr. Epps received a sentence of 235 months. Mr. McCrory, after some reasons that are in his record that I won't repeat here in court, received a sentence of 102 months. Those sentences in my mind are obviously appropriately higher than the sentence in this case based on the extent of their involvement.

Next I look at Sam Waggoner and Irb Benjamin. Both had guideline ranges below Dr. Reddix's range. Waggoner received a 60-month sentence, and Benjamin received a 70-month sentence. Like Dr. Reddix, neither had a criminal history. But one thing that made their ranges lower is that the benefits or losses associated with those defendants were well below those in this case. Waggoner was just under \$264,000; Benjamin was just over \$300,000.

In this case, it's \$2.5 million. In my opinion it would create an unwarranted disparity if Dr. Reddix received a sentence below the one that Benjamin received. Benjamin was paying for about the same length of time for the same basic reason but was paying a little less. And the benefits attributed to him of the loss amount was about eight times less than those related to Dr. Reddix's case.

I also note and the name came up earlier that Mark

Longoria received a 60-month sentence, but as I understand it,

that sentence was the statutory maximum sentence for the

offense to which he was found guilty which makes it less

comparable.

2.4

That leaves Robert Simmons. Simmons received an 87-month sentence. He worked for a time for Dr. Reddix, but he also had other schemes with Epps, so his culpability is arguably greater. I would also note that -- I'm sorry. I think his culpability was greater. The total benefits he received were also more than those received by Dr. Reddix.

There were some other factors again in that case that are on the record in that case that I won't go into that resulted in a reduction to 87 months. But based on all of that, a sentence above that received by Simmons would be unfair to Dr. Reddix.

That tells me that in this case a guideline sentence would be greater than necessary. To summarize all of that, it seems to me that Dr. Reddix should fall somewhere between Benjamin and Simmons, and this sentence does that.

It's also sufficient but not greater than necessary when viewed in light of all the sentencing factors that I have addressed and those that I have looked at but deemed less relevant. I would also note as I did early on that I always try to calculate the correct guideline range whether I follow it or not. I have done this in this case, but the guideline calculation itself obviously had no ultimate impact on the sentence that's been imposed.

It is, therefore, the judgment of the court that the

defendant, Carl Reddix, serve a term of 72 months imprisonment as to Count 7 in the custody of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

This sentence is outside the guideline range but is in accordance with the factors found in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a).

The guideline range for a fine in this case is 15,000 to 150,000. Based on the defendant's financial disclosures but also the amount of the forfeiture, I'm going to impose a sentence at the bottom of the guideline range of \$15,000.

The term of imprisonment shall be immediately followed by a two-year term of supervised release subject to the standard and mandatory conditions as listed on the judgment order in addition to the following special conditions:

1. You shall not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer until such time as the fine has been paid in full.

Second, you shall provide the probation office with access to any requested financial information until such time as the fine is paid in full.

Third, you shall participate in a program of mental health treatment as directed by the probation office. If enrolled in a mental health treatment program, you shall abstain from consuming alcoholic beverages during treatment and shall abstain for the remaining period of supervision. You shall contribute to the cost of treatment in accordance with

the probation office copay policy. That condition is obviously based on references in the presentence report.

The interest requirement for the fine is waived. The fine is to be paid in full within 180 days of the date of the judgment order.

Forfeiture in this amount -- in this case is entered in the amount reflected on the preliminary order of forfeiture in the amount of one million two hundred and sixty-six thousand four hundred and thirty-eight thousand [sic] dollars. It is further ordered that the defendant pay the mandatory special assessment of \$100 which is due immediately.

All right. Mr. LaMarca, you probably have a motion.

MR. LAMARCA: I do, Your Honor. We do move to dismiss the remaining counts of the indictment, and I do have an order for the court's consideration.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. I will sign that. Why don't you come forward.

## (DOCUMENT TENDERED TO COURT)

THE COURT: Mr. Cory, is there any request here?

MR. CORY: Yes, Your Honor. Dr. Reddix would ask that the court recommend that he serve his sentence at the Butner Federal Prison in North Carolina.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Reddix, obviously that's not up to me, but I will make that recommendation on your behalf.

Anything else?

2<del>4</del>  MR. CORY: Yes, Your Honor. And we would ask that you also recommend that he participate in alcohol treatment.

THE COURT: All right. I was considering that. If you are requesting it, I will grant it, and that will be a term of supervised release that he shall participate in a program of testing and/or treatment for alcohol or drug abuse. Not that there is a drug issue here. But as directed by the probation officer. If enrolled in an alcohol or drug treatment program, he shall abstain from consuming alcoholic beverages during treatment and shall continue abstaining for the remaining period of supervision. He shall contribute to the cost of treatment in accordance with the probation office copay policy. I would also note that obviously the Bureau of Prisons will screen and I think it's fairly typical to receive that care as well.

MR. CORY: Finally, Judge, we would move and make a motion for the court that Dr. Reddix be allowed to remain on bond and self report so that he can take care of financial matters.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. LaMarca, is there any reason why the defendant should not remain on bond pending designation?

MR. LAMARCA: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Is the probation office aware of any reason?

PROBATION OFFICER: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That request seems perfectly reasonable to me. The defendant will be allowed to remain on bond and voluntarily surrender to the institution designated by the U.S. Bureau of Prisons on January 29, 2018, at noon.

All right. Mr. Cory, any other requests?

MR. CORY: No, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Dr. Reddix, when you entered your plea, you gave up some rights to appeal. But to the extent that there are any issues that can be appealed, that has to be done in a timely manner. There are some exceptions, but usually that's 14 days after judgment.

Mr. Cory, I assume you will discuss that with your client.

MR. CORY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: I am required to say that if you cannot afford an attorney, you can petition the court to appeal in forma pauperis.

Dr. Reddix, I know this is a blow, and I want to assure you it is not something that I took lightly in any sense. But I do want to tell you that unlike a lot of people who come through here, you have a tremendous support structure behind you. And in some sense, today is sort of the beginning of the light at the end of the tunnel. I mean it's all in front of you now. You know what it is. And I have no doubt

that with your talents and your support that you can make a real contribution from here forward, and I hope that for you. Is there anything further from either side? MR. LAMARCA: No, Your Honor. MR. CORY: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We're adjourned. 

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, BRENDA D. WOLVERTON, Official Court Reporter,
United States District Court, Southern District of
Mississippi, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing
pages contain a full, true and correct transcript of the
proceedings had in the aforenamed case at the time and
place indicated, which proceedings were recorded by me to
the best of my skill and ability.

I certify that the transcript fees and format comply with those prescribed by the Court and Judicial Conference of the United States.

This the 7th day of February, 2018.

s/ Brenda D. Wolverton\_\_\_\_\_\_
BRENDA D. WOLVERTON, RPR-CRR

Τ,